REMARKS

Claims 17-36 are pending in the application. Claim 17 is an independent claim. Claims 17-36 stand rejected. Applicants herein amend claims 17, 18, 21, 24-27, 30, 31, 33, and 35. No new matter has been added. Further review and consideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 / 103(a)

Claims 17-36 stand rejected under either 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,287 ("Kumar"), or 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kumar in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,851 to Plutowski, or over Kumar in view of <u>C. Liebig et al.</u> A Publish/Subscribe CORBA Persistent State Service Prototype. Middleware 2000:IFIP/ACM International Conference on Distributed Systems Platforms, New York, NY, U.S.A., April 200. Proceedings. Applicants traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 17, it recites in part "receiving from an application that operates in user space of an operating system, a request identifying an item stored in a database management program integrated with a file system of the operating system, said item having <u>a scope that includes at least one additional item</u> ... [and] executing, by the database management program integrated with the file system, a query on said object for at least one additional item, the query <u>utilizing the scope of the identified item as a parameter</u>." The Examiner stated that the Abstract and column 16, lines 8-30 teach the above referenced subject matter. Applicants disagree. The Examiner stated that "what's covered in the database" reads on a scope that include at least one additional item. (Office Action at p. 3). Applicants submit that information in a database fails to teach or suggest an item that has a scope, the scope including at least one additional item. A teaching of a database that has information in it does not anticipate an item that has certain characteristics. Moreover, Kumar fails to teach using the scope of an item as a parameter in a query. According to Kumar, a 'Query' attribute specif[ies] values used to query or retrieve specific data fields from the associated data store... the query=attribute specifies a value or values akin to the 'from' and 'where' clause in an SQL statement." (Kumar at col. 16, lines 8-15).

Applicants additionally submit that Kumar fails to teach or suggest "receiving from an application that operates in user space of an operating system, a request identifying an item stored in a database management program integrated with a file system of the operating system, said item having a scope that includes at least one additional item, wherein the operating system is configured to store, while in kernel mode, data in the file system as file streams, and generate, while in kernel mode, items associated with the file streams in the database management program." For example, Kumar is related to distributed systems where a client program attempts to connect to a remote data store. (See, e.g., Abstract, FIG. 2, and associated text). Claim 17 is directed towards a set of interactions between applications such as, for example, e-mail programs, word processing programs, picture viewing programs, and the like that operate in user space of the operating system and the file system. In embodiments of the present disclosure, when the operating system receives a request to save data for applications, a database management program portion of the file system can create items indicative of the data and the underlying data, e.g., the files, can be stored in the file system. Instead of passing a request to the file system for a specific file stored at a specific address, the applications can request the data and the database management program integrated with the file system can be used to find where the physical file is on the hard disk. The claimed configuration overcomes limitations of a traditional file system by providing a way for the operating system to use the power of a database management program to identify the actual information stored in the file system. This is significantly different than traditional file systems that have little to no information about the actual content stored on the physical hard drive. This teaching is absent from the art of record. Accordingly, for at least these reasons Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 17.

Insomuch as dependent claims 18-36 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 17 they too patentably define over Kumar for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 18-36.

CONCLUSION

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider the rejections and issue a Notice of
Allowance of all the claims.

Date: April 9, 2008

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439